

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/778,988	02/07/2001	Thomas V. Ressemann	TER1002USD1	6567	
75	590 12/03/2004	EXAMINER			
Thomas E. Po	povich, Esq.	JACKSON, SUZI	JACKSON, SUZETTE JAMIE		
Popovich & Wi IDS Center, Sui		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
80 South 8th St		3738			
Minneapolis, M	IN 55402	DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004	-13		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					$I \cap \Lambda$
9		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)	1,0
		09/778,98	8	RESSEMANN ET	AL.
Office Action S	ummary	Examiner		Art Unit	
		Suzette J		3738	
The MAILING DATE of Period for Reply	this communication a	ppears on the	cover sheet with the	e correspondence ad	dress
A SHORTENED STATUTOR THE MAILING DATE OF TH - Extensions of time may be available u after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailir - If the period for reply specified above - If NO period for reply is specified above - Failure to reply within the set or exten- Any reply received by the Office later earned patent term adjustment. See S	IS COMMUNICATION nder the provisions of 37 CFR g date of this communication. s less than thirty (30) days, a re, the maximum statutory period period for reply will, by stathan three months after the ma	N. 1.136(a). In no eve eply within the statu od will apply and wil tute, cause the appl	int, however, may a reply be story minimum of thirty (30) o Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro ication to become ABANDO	timely filed days will be considered timel om the mailing date of this con NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to commu 2a)□ This action is FINAL. 3)□ Since this application is	2b)⊠ TI s in condition for allow	his action is no vance except	on-final. for formal matters, p		e merits is
closed in accordance v	will the practice unde	i Ex parte Qui	<i>ayle</i> , 1933 C.D. 11,	455 O.G. 215.	
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,8-10 and</u> 4a) Of the above claim 5) □ Claim(s) is/are 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,8-10 and</u> 7) □ Claim(s) is/are 8) □ Claim(s) are su	(s) is/are withd allowed. <u>22-24</u> is/are rejected. objected to.	rawn from cor	nsideration.		
Application Papers					
9) The specification is obj 10) The drawing(s) filed on Applicant may not reques Replacement drawing sh 11) The oath or declaration	is/are: a) ☐ a st that any objection to the eet(s) including the corr	ccepted or b) he drawing(s) b ection is require	e held in abeyance. Sed if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 Cl	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is matching a) All b) Some * c) 1. Certified copies 2. Certified copies 3. Copies of the ce	None of: of the priority docume of the priority docume rtified copies of the pe the International Bure	ents have bee ents have bee riority docume eau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applic ents have been rece e 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National	Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent D 3) Information Disclosure Statement Paper No(s)/Mail Date	rawing Review (PTO-948)	08)	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:		O-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/778,988

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's RCE and response dated September 9, 2004 have been received in application serial number 09/778,988.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 8-10 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin 5,653,743 in view of McNamara et al. 6,004,347. Martin discloses the invention as currently claimed noting figures 1, and 3-5 comprising: A prosthetic graft (1) for placement by a single delivery catheter at the bifurcation of a common iliac artery into external iliac and internal iliac arteries with in the vasculature of a patient comprising (see col. 1, lines 59-65; col. 3, lines 51-65 and col. 4, lines 15-30 and note that this is functional language): a first graft conduit having first and second ends and a second graft conduit attached in fluid communication with the first graft conduit (this includes grafts 1, 8 and 18-19); wherein the first and second graft conduits

Art Unit: 3738

are sized and configured to be contained within and delivered by a delivery catheter and Martin also that the graft may have a stainless steel self-expanding support/stent that may be placed and/or that the graft my be partially reinforced (see col. 2, lines 53-55 and col. 3, lines 1-6), however Martin does not specify that there are stents at the ends of grafting system used for anchoring the prosthesis. McNamara et al. teaches a vascular graft that utilizes multiple stents at the ends to anchor the graft (see col. 2, lines 58-60; 64-65; col. 9 lines 30-35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the invention of Martin and utilize the anchor/stent as taught by McNamara et al. on/inside of every end of a graft whether it was single, bifurcated, or ever trifurcated because it is well known that because most grafts are made from a flexible thin material they need support which is offered by the use of a stent and the grafts also because the stents prevent the graft from dislodging or migrating from the deployed position.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant contends that the prior art reference Quiachon et al. 6,322,587 was not for use at the aortic bifurcation and was not sized or adapted to be anchored in the internal and external iliac arteries. The above reference meets the limitations as currently claimed. It is noted that most of the

Art Unit: 3738

claim language is functional and the current rejection is capable of performing the functions.

Conclusion

- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the 5. examiner should be directed to Suzette J. Jackson whose work schedule is Monday-Friday 9-6:30 off every other Friday and whose telephone number is 571-272-4751.
- The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding 6. is assigned are 703-872-9306.
- Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or 7. proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

19 November 2004